
SBAS

Description

Name: Statewide Budgeting and Accounting System (SBAS)

Age: 24 years, major modifications 14 years ago

Platform: IBM 3090, COBOL applications and reporting tools

Description: Statewide centralized general accounting system

Functionality

- On-line entry and edit for decentralized data capture with batch processing
- Centralized processing of the State's financial information
- Standard chart of accounts and consistent reporting structure across State agencies
- Budgetary control of transactions at the reporting center level based upon appropriations
- Flexibility in defining reporting structures at the State agency level
- Standard reports for month-end and year-end results

Strengths

Financial Reporting

- Contains uniform accounting and reporting standards that provide for consistency in financial information across State agencies

- Consolidates financial information across State agencies for reporting purposes such as preparation of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)
- Provides usable standard reports at defined reporting intervals

Decentralized Data Entry and Edit

- Allows for entry of financial information at distributed locations (point of capture) through On-line Entry and Edit (OE&E) application
- System Stability
- Affords a stable processing environment that is well-documented
- Plans for disaster recovery

Ease of Use

- Provides easy transaction input capabilities for end-users

Cost Effective

- Requires a low level of maintenance and processing costs
- Provides cost economies of scale compared to stand-alone agency-owned systems

Weaknesses

Reporting

- Does not accommodate the reporting needs of many State agencies
- Provides reporting that is not timely
- Accommodates only a single fiscal year of data

- Formats reports that are difficult to understand and do not meet many agency needs

Capabilities

- Accommodates no transaction with a magnitude greater than \$100 Million
- Affords limited additional expenditure and appropriation codes
- Is not Year 2000 compliant (cost impacts unknown)
- Does not provide forecasting functionality

Data Access

- Presents problems for end-users in accessing financial information
- Limits ability to sort or accumulate data at the agency or object of expenditure levels

Costs

- Approximately \$200,000 for centralized processing and \$100,000 for On-line Entry and Edit processing (per year)

Assessment

Function

- Limited functionality compared to business needs and directions of State agencies
- Not integrated with other core administrative systems such as PPP and MIBS
- Reporting capabilities are limited due to flat file layouts
- Difficulty in accumulating and managing information related to proprietary activities due to reporting structure of system (responsibility center)

- Inability to accumulate and “roll up” information within and across State agencies
- No ability to track nonfinancial performance data

Access

- Limited access to data by State agencies
- No access to public, suppliers, and other external stakeholders
- Single point of data entry accomplished through distributed technologies

Operations

- Not easily integrated with operational systems
- Expensive to upgrade
- Low maintenance costs
- Operational costs are moderate
- Moderately easy to learn and use

Technology

- Not Year 2000 compliant
- Not open systems compliant

Issues

- Risk of withdrawal from SBAS by large State agencies due to lack of functionality (i.e., migration to agency-owned systems)
- Loss of the single experienced programmer on the system could be detrimental to proper maintenance
- Changing reporting requirements from GASB and the federal government cannot be accommodated

Warrant Writer

Description

Name: Warrant Writer

Age:

Platform: IBM 3090, COBOL applications

Description: Statewide centralized warrant processing system

Functionality

- On-line entry and edit for decentralized data capture with batch processing
- Centralized processing and control of warrant transactions
- Automated production of hardcopy warrants
- Ability to generate electronic funds transfers to payees
- Comprehensive database of warrant information and payees

Strengths

Decentralized Data Entry and Edit

- Allows for entry of financial information at distributed locations (point of capture) through On-line Entry and Edit (OE&E) application

Payment Timeliness

- Provides for the issuance of warrants in a timely manner (usually the day after the transaction is input into OE&E)

Centralized Payee Database

- Maintains a centralized payee database for the State that is used for Form 1099 issuance and other administrative purposes

Collections Capabilities

- Interfaces with the centralized collections system in order to identify payees who are debtors of the State and suspend payments for collection purposes

Payment Flexibility

- Allows for flexibility in the type of payment method used (e.g., mail, direct deposit, etc.)
- System Stability and Integrity
- Provides accurate data with good audit trails
- Affords a stable processing environment
- Plans for disaster recovery

Ease of Use

- Provides easy transaction input capabilities for end-users

Cost Effective

- Requires a low level of maintenance and processing costs

- Provides cost economies of scale compared to stand-alone agency-owned systems

Weaknesses

Form 1099 Issuance

- Requires high level of training at agency level to understand types of goods/services provided by vendors that are 1099 applicable (to ensure data accuracy)
- Requires numerous adjustments to data input by agencies for accurate tax reporting

Payee Ids

- Does not verify the validity of payee IDs when warrants are processed resulting in duplicate IDs for the same vendor
- Processing Limitations
- Will not process greater than 10,000 transactions in a single run
- Systems Integration
- Transfers only the claim number to SBAS resulting in a cumbersome process when researching payments
- Does not interface with the purchasing system

Costs

- To be provided

Assessment

Function

- Adequate functionality compared to business needs and directions
- Limited integration with other core administrative systems such as SBAS
- Reporting capabilities are limited

Access

- Access to data by agencies complicated because of inability to extract agency-specific warrant information
- Single point of data entry accomplished through distributed technologies

Operations

- Interfaces with operational systems appear to be efficient
- Low maintenance costs
- Operational costs are moderate
- Moderately easy to learn and use

Technology

- Year 2000 compliant
- Not open systems compliant

Issues

- Loss of the single experienced programmer on the system could be detrimental to proper maintenance
- Limited systems documentation

PPP

Description

Name: Payroll, Personnel and Position Control System (PPP)

Age: 14 years

Platform: IBM 3090, COBOL and CULPRIT applications and reporting tools

Description: Statewide centralized human resource management system

Functionality

- Integrated database of personnel, payroll and position information shared between the three primary sections of the system
- Prepayroll (DOS based) application allows for decentralized data capture
- Direct interfaces with SBAS and TESSERACT; indirect interfaces with the Department of Labor and the IRS
- Produces standard payroll reports following every pay period

Strengths

Reliability

- Provides a reliable and stable system for the processing of personnel and payroll information
- Plans for disaster recovery

Reporting

- Provides good internal reports

Decentralized Data Entry

- Allows for data entry at distributed agency locations

Cost Effective

- Requires a low level of maintenance and processing costs
- Provides cost economies of scale compared to stand-alone agency-owned systems

Weaknesses

Applications

- Lacks many applications that are necessary to manage the State's workforce at the agency level such as performance information, development profiles and compensation determination tools

Reporting

- Does not provide reporting capabilities that address the needs of many State agencies
- Presents problems in balancing position data with information in SBAS and MIBS
- Does not summarize information by agency or project

Data Access

- Access to personnel data by agencies limited due to confidentiality issues
- Presents difficulties in downloading payroll information often resulting in duplicative manual efforts by agency personnel

System Use

- Requires significant training of agency employees for proper use

System Flexibility

- Affords limited flexibility in reporting capabilities
- Lacks the ability to accommodate programming changes easily (i.e., ripple effects of programming changes are numerous)

Costs

- Approximately \$100,000 for centralized processing (per year)

Assessment

Function

- Limited functionality compared to business needs and directions of State agencies
- Limited integration with other core administrative systems such as SBAS and MIBS
- Reporting capabilities are limited
- Difficulty in accumulating and managing information related to proprietary activities due to reporting structure of system (responsibility center)
- Inability to accumulate and “roll up” information across and within agencies

- No ability to track nonfinancial performance data

Access

- Limited access to data by agencies
- Single point of data entry accomplished through distributed technologies

Operations

- Ability to integrate with operational systems very limited
- Expensive to upgrade
- Low maintenance costs
- Operational costs are moderate
- Difficult to learn and use

Technology

- Not Year 2000 compliant
- Not open systems compliant

Issues

- Very sensitive to ISD turnover for programming expertise
- System capabilities unable to accommodate future changes in the human resources area (e.g., decentralization of personnel decisionmaking, responsibilities, etc. to agency managers)

MIBS (as proposed)

Description

Name: Montana Integrated Budget System (MIBS)

Age: Under development

Platform: Oracle database, Designer 2000 custom applications

Description: Statewide budgeting system

Functionality

- Centrally controlled budget database (for all agencies)
- Ability to modify data and control versions of budget throughout development process
- Intent to build interfaces with SBAS and PPP to ensure data integrity between systems
- Reporting flexibility due to query abilities in relational database
- Potential for forecasting of both fiscal and human resources
- Accommodates the development of agency operating plans

Strengths

Data Integrity

- Provides valid and accurate data that will feed other administrative systems

Database Integration

- Integrates the historically separate budget databases of the Governor's Office and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Data Access

- Provides for increased access by agency users and other stakeholders through Browser, Lotus Approach and other desktop applications

Process Improvement

- Improves use of human resources dedicated to the budget process by eliminating significant duplication of effort among agency, budget office and legislative staffs

Ownership

- Provides full ownership of the application and royalty rights to the State

Enterprise-Wide Perspective

- Provides an enterprise-wide perspective to the budget process rather than a disaggregated agency perspective

Weaknesses

Budget Justifications

- Does not provide for the input of budget justifications, explanations or commentary

- Analytical Tools
- Provides limited analytical tools to perform budget analysis
- Systems Integration
- Affords limited integration with other administrative systems such as SBAS and PPP

Costs

- To be provided

Assessment

Function

- Limited functionality compared to business needs and directions of State agencies
- Not integrated with other core administrative systems such as PPP and EBS
- Reporting capabilities are good
- Ability to accumulate and “roll up” information within and across agencies
- No ability to track nonfinancial performance data

Access

- Good access to data by agencies
- Increased access to stakeholders possible
- Single point of data entry accomplished through distributed technologies

Operations

- Maintenance costs may be significant
- Operational costs may be significant
- Difficult to learn and use

Technology

- Year 2000 compliant
- Open systems compliant
- Consistent with established standards

Issues

- Expertise necessary to maintain the system and develop enhancements is not available within the State
- Training agency users presents challenges

PAMS

Description

Name: Property Accountability and Management System (PAMS)

Age:

Platform: IBM 3090, COBOL applications and reporting tools

Description: Statewide centralized fixed asset tracking system

Functionality

- Accounting for the State's fixed asset inventory
- Reporting of the location, value and age of fixed assets
- Calculates depreciation for proprietary fixed assets and feeds information to SBAS

Strengths

System Stability

- Provides a stability and reliability in performing operations

Data Simplicity

- Affords the ability to make changes to groups of assets due to the simplicity of the data files

Weaknesses

System Functionality

- Provides limited functionality to manage fixed assets effectively (e.g., asset operations functionality)
- Does not provide ability to track non-capitalized assets

System Use

- Presents difficulties to end-users due to system complexity
- Requires the submission of hardcopy forms to add, delete or modify fixed asset information

Reporting

- Provides limited utility in standard reports
- Provides reports that are not timely in meeting agency needs

Data Consistency

- Results in data that is not consistent across State agencies in comprehensiveness of level of detail

Systems Integration

- Interfaces with SBAS in a cumbersome manner
- Does not interface with the purchasing system

Costs

- To be provided

Assessment

Function

- Limited functionality compared to business needs and directions of State agencies
- Limited integration with other core administrative systems such as SBAS
- Reporting capabilities are limited due to flat file layouts
- Inability to accumulate and “roll up” information within and across agencies
- No ability to track nonfinancial performance or operational data

Access

- Limited access to data by agencies
- No access to public, suppliers, and other external stakeholders
- Hardcopy based data entry with no distributed access

Operations

- Not easily integrated with operational systems
- Expensive to upgrade
- Low maintenance costs
- Operational costs are moderate
- Difficult to learn and use

Technology

- Not Year 2000 compliant
- Not open systems compliant

Issues

- Most State agencies have created their own systems or databases that duplicate information resident in PAMS
- Expertise of programmers in this area is a threat to system
- New GASB reporting model will make system inadequate and obsolete

TESSERACT

Description

Name: TESSERACT

Age: 2 years

Platform: IBM 3090, COBOL and ASSEMBLER applications and reporting tools (package solution)

Description: Centralized benefits system

Functionality

- Centralized database of personnel, eligibility and premiums information for all agency personnel
- Performs analysis on completeness and accuracy of employee payroll deductions
- Builds output files for benefit providers (e.g., Blue Cross/Blue Shield) on employee eligibility
- Interfaces with other administrative systems such as PPP and PERS

Strengths

System Updates

- Provides for new software releases from vendor every two years and periodic vendor-provided maintenance (not always adopted)
- Affords ease of implementation for new software releases due to only slight modifications made to applications
- Accommodates new benefits programs with ease (flexible)

User Satisfaction

- Results in a high level of user satisfaction within the Benefits groups
- Provides robust functionality to manage effectively the State's benefits programs

System Stability

- Provides a stable and reliable processing environment
- Plans for disaster recovery

Data Integrity

- Provides information that is highly reliable and balances to payroll information
- Furnishes excellent ability to track employee information

Weaknesses

Data Access

- Provides limited access by agency staff to personnel and related benefit information
- Provides access to information with formats that are difficult for end-users to understand and analyze

Systems Integration

- Is not integrated with other core administrative systems such as PPP resulting in duplicate information in databases

Costs

Approximately \$85,000 for centralized processing

Function

- Good functionality compared to business needs and directions of State agencies
- Not integrated with other core administrative systems such as PPP
- Reporting capabilities are good

Access

- Limited access to data by agencies - no input capabilities, information in formats that are difficult to understand
- No access to public, suppliers, and other external stakeholders
- Central data entry at DOA requiring the generation of hardcopy benefits forms at the agency level

Operations

- Not easily integrated with operational systems?
- Inexpensive to upgrade
- Low maintenance costs
- Operational costs are moderate
- Moderately difficult to learn and use

Technology

- Year 2000 compliant
- Not open systems compliant
- Does not support diverse technology use

Issues

- Application not supported by ISD staff (Benefits programmers maintain system)